

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-27 were examined and reported in the Office Action. Claims 1-5 are rejected. Claim 6 is canceled. Claims 1, 7, 8 and 18 are amended. Claims 1-5 and 7-27 remain.

Applicant requests reconsideration of the application in view of the following remarks.

**I. 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)**

It is asserted in the Office Action that claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b), as being anticipated by IEEE Publication “*Routing Lookups in Hardware at Memory Access Speeds*” by Gupta et al. (“Gupta”). Applicant respectfully traverses the aforementioned rejection for the following reasons.

It is asserted in the Office Action that claim 6 would be allowable if re-written in independent form. Applicant has amended claim 1 to include the limitations of claim 6. Therefore, Applicant’s amended claim 1 is placed in allowable form.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) rejection for claim 1 is respectfully requested.

**II. 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

A. It is asserted in the Office Action that claims 2-5 are rejected in the Office Action under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as being unpatentable over Gupta, in view of U. S. Patent 6,993,031 issued to Murase (“Murase”). Applicant respectfully traverses the aforementioned rejection for the following reasons.

Applicant’s claims 2-5 either directly or indirectly depend on amended claim 1. As asserted above, Applicant’s amended claim 1 is now placed in allowable form. Therefore, the claims that depend on amended claim 1, namely claims 2-5, are also placed in allowable form for the same reason.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection for claims 2-5 is respectfully requested.

**III. Allowable Subject Matter**

Applicant notes with appreciation the Examiner's assertion that claims 6-15 and 18-27 would be allowed if the minor informalities stated above with regards to claims 6 and 18 were fixed. In addition, claims 16-17 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicant has amended claim 1 to include the limitations of claim 6 and has amended claim 18 to overcome the informal objection.

Applicant respectfully asserts that claims 1-5 and 7-27, as they now stand, are allowable for the reasons given above.

**CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that claims 1-5 and 7-27 patentably define the subject invention over the cited references of record, and are in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited at the earliest possible date. If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would be useful in moving the case forward, he is encouraged to contact the undersigned at (310) 207-3800.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2666 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.17, particularly, extension of time fees.

**PETITION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME**

Per 37 C.F.R. 1.136(a) and in connection with the Office Action mailed on May 17, 2007, Applicant respectfully petitions the Commissioner for a two (2) month extension of time, extending the period for response to October 17, 2007. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge payment to Deposit Account No. 02-2666 in the amount of \$230.00 to cover the petition filing fee for a 37 C.F.R. 1.17(a)(2) small entity. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR, & ZAFMAN LLP

Dated: October 3, 2007

By: 

Steven Laut, Reg. No. 47,736

1279 Oakmead Parkway  
Sunnyvale, California 94085-4040  
(310) 207-3800

**CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION**

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being submitted electronically via EFS Web on the date shown below to the United States Patent and Trademark Office.

  
Jean Svoboda

Date: October 3, 2007